



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

---

ADJOINING LANDOWNERS—LATERAL SUPPORT.—Defendant was sued for injuries to plaintiff's dwelling on an adjoining lot caused by defendant's having excavated on his lot after having given plaintiff notice of the intended excavation. *Held*, defendant, after having given plaintiff reasonable notice of the intended excavation, was not liable for injuries to plaintiff's building which resulted from defendant's "ordinarily careful excavation of his own lot." *Vandegrift, et al. v. Boward* (Md. 1916), 98 Atl. 528.

In the absence of statute it is well settled that a landowner who in excavating on his land injures a building on adjoining land is liable only if the injury has resulted from his negligence. *Pullan v. Stallman*, 76 N. J. L. 10, 56 Atl. 116; *Simon v. Nance*, 45 Tex. Civ. App. 480, 100 S. W. 1038. What a landowner intending to excavate on his land need do to protect himself from liability may not always be readily determined. The Maryland Supreme Court has held: (1), that notice of the proposed excavation is necessary, and that, after having given notice, the excavator must exercise "due care and skill, at his peril, to prevent injury to the adjoining landowner." *Shafer v. Wilson*, 44 Md. 268; (2), that failure to give notice is not necessarily fatal, and if notice is given there is no liability if the excavation is made with reasonable and ordinary care. *Bonaparte v. Wiseman*, 89 Md. 12, 42 Atl. 918, 44 L. R. A. 482; (3), that if notice has been given there is liability only for "actual and positive negligence in the manner of doing the work," and the excavator need not use "the same care that a prudent man would exercise in similar circumstances." *Serio v. Murphy, et al*, 99 Md. 545, 58 Atl. 435, 105 Am. St. Rep. 316; and (4), that the duty of a landowner whose property is liable to be injured, after having been notified, is merely to protect his property against an inevitable injury which might otherwise result from the most careful performance of the excavation. *Hanrahan v. Baltimore City*, 114 Md. 517, 80 Atl. 312. It would seem a task of no little difficulty to reconcile all of these pronouncements. A late Michigan case has made "reasonable precautions" necessary, the jury to determine what was reasonable. *Bissell v. Ford*, 176 Mich. 64, quoting *Gildersleeve v. Hammond*, 109 Mich. 431, 67 N. W. 519, 33 L. R. A. 46. A North Carolina case makes notice of the extent of the excavation necessary. *Davis v. Summerfield*, 131 N. C. 352.

BANKRUPTCY—SUSPENSION OF STATE LAWS.—A farmer appealed from an order declaring him insolvent and appointing a trustee to manage and dispose of his estate as provided by the state insolvency law. *Held*, that Congress by expressly exempting farmers from involuntary bankruptcy (§ 4b), to the extent of that exemption intended not to suspend the state insolvency laws. *Pitcher v. Standish*, (Conn. 1916), 98 Atl. 93.

There is no doubt that to the extent the state and national acts cover the same field the former is suspended. *Ketchum v. McNamara*, 72 Conn. 709,